

REMARKS

The claims are claims 9 to 11, 14, 21, 22 and 28 to 33.

Claims 1 to 8, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 25 to 27 are newly canceled. Claims 9, 11, 14 and 21 are amended. New claims 28 to 33 are added. New claim 28 recites subject matter of canceled claim 8 with explicit recitation of the external ports. Claims 9 and 14 are amended to depend upon new claim 28 rather than canceled claim 8. New claim 29 corresponds to canceled claim 6. New claim 30 recites subject canceled claim 19 with explicit recitation of the external ports. New claims 31 to 33 correspond to respective claims 4, 5 and 6.

Claims 1 to 11, 14, 19 and 21 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Shoobe et al U.S. Patent No. 6,725,310.

Claims 28 and 30 recite subject matter not anticipated by Shoobe et al. Claims 28 and 30 each recite "a plurality of I/O ports" and a docking connector "including a low pin count serial I/O port." Claims 28 and 32 each recite an LPC controller adapted "to detect whether the portable computer is coupled to a docking station," "to route data transmissions from said I/O bus to said I/O ports if the portable computer is not coupled to a docking station" and "to route data transmissions from said I/O bus to said low pin count serial I/O port" if the portable computer is coupled to a docking station. These claims require routing data from the I/O bus to differing output connectors dependent upon detection of a docking connection.

Shoobe et al fails to teach this alternative operation of the I/O ports and the low pin count serial I/O port based upon whether the portable computer is docked or undocked. Figure 3 of Shoobe et al illustrates that notebook 300 has docking connector 303a which mates with docking connector 303b of dock 302. The FINAL REJECTION

states at page 2, line 22 to page 3, line 9 that Shoobe et al discloses:

"A controller (Q Switch, 318a) coupled to the parallel input port (PCI, 312) and configured to detect whether the input/output I/O bridge device is connected to the docking station (Shoobe teaches of the I/O bridge device (316) capable of detecting if the notebook is docked, COL. 5, lines 63 - 67), to route signals from the parallel input port (AGP Controller 309) to the serial output port (AGP Enable) if the input/output (I/O) bridge device is connected to a docking station (Shoobe teaches that when the notebook is in a docking phase, the high speed serial path is enabled, COL. 5, line 67 - COL. 6, line 2; and to route signals from the parallel input port to at least one of the parallel output ports (318b, 318c of figure 3) if the input/output (I/O) bridge device is not connected to the docking station, (Shoobe teaches that the parallel inputs gets routed through the parallel outputs when the notebook is not in the docking station, COL.6 lines 7 - 9);"

Figure 3 of Shoobe et al shows that switch 324 when closed because notebook 300 is docked routes data from APG controller 309 to high speed controller 318 of logic interface 316. According to the FINAL REJECTION this data from AGP controller 309 is routed via MCH 306, ICH 310 and either: PCI bus 312 to Q switch 318a of logic interface 316; or USB bus 318b of LPC bus 318c go logic interface 316. Figure 3 of Shoobe et al illustrates the logic interface 316 is coupled to docking connector 303a. Since Shoobe et al shows no other connector, this data must pass by output by docking connector 303a. Thus Shoobe et al fails to teach the separately recited connectors of claims 28 and 32 nor the routing to these separate connectors dependent upon whether the portable computer is docked. Shoobe et al teaches differing routing of data but not different I/O ports dependent upon whether the portable computer is docked. Accordingly, claims 28 and 32 are allowable over Shoobe et al.

Claims 14 and 31 recite subject matter not anticipated by Shoobe et al. Claims 14 and 31 recite "a packetizer/depacketizer"

coupled to the serialization logic and the LPC controller. Paragraph 13 of the FINAL REJECTION states that Shoobe et al teaches a packetizer/depacketizer without citing any particular structure. The Applicants respectfully submit that Shoobe et al fails to mention packetization or depacketization or even packets. In light of this lack, Shoobe et al cannot anticipate the packetization/depacketization recited in claims 14 and 31. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, the Applicants request citation of a particular structure or teaching in Shoobe et al that teaches this claimed packetization/depacketization. Accordingly, claims 14 and 31 are allowable over Shoobe et al.

Claims 9 and 32 recite subject matter not anticipated by Shoobe et al. Claims 9 and 32 each recite a "floppy disk controller." Paragraphs 9 and 11 of the FINAL REJECTION state that Shoobe et al teaches a floppy disk controller citing Figure 1A, and column 3, lines 18 to 29 and lines 39 to 43. The Applicants respectfully submit that Shoobe et al in fact does not mention a floppy disk controller. The port types noted in Figure 1A does not include a floppy disk controller. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, the Applicants request citation of a particular structure or teaching in Shoobe et al that teaches this claimed floppy disk controller. Accordingly, claims 9 and 32 are allowable over Shoobe et al.

Claims 10, 11, 21, 22 are allowable by dependence upon respective allowable base claims 18 and 30.

The Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of this amendment. Entry of this amendment is proper at this time because the amendment serves only to clarify subject matter previously recited. Thus no new search or reconsideration is required.


The Applicants respectfully submit that all the present claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore early

entry of this amendment, reconsideration and advance to issue are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed telephone number and address to facilitate prosecution.

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(972) 917-5290
Fax: (972) 917-4418

Respectfully submitted,



Robert D. Marshall, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,527